

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1 through 49 were pending in the Application. The Examiner rejected all claims. Claims 1-49 remain pending in this Application. Applicants traverse the rejections below.

### **I. Traversal of the Objection to the Drawings**

Figure 1 was objected to for not including a prior art label, and due to element 100 not being mentioned in the Specification.

Together with this Response, a proposed drawing change which labels Figure 1 as prior art is included. Also, the Specification has been amended to identify the already-included element which should have the reference numeral 100 identifying it.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Drawings should now be in conformance with the various requirements, and that the objections have been obviated. The Examiner's attention to these details and pointing them out is appreciated.

### **II. Traversal of the Objection to the Abstract**

The Examiner objected to the Abstract for a number of informalities. In this Response, a new Abstract has been submitted which should obviate the objections.

### **III. Traversal of the Rejections over the Cited Art**

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-14, 17-30, 33-46 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the Bachmann article (Bachmann). The Office Action rejected Claims 15, 16, 31, 32, 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bachmann in view of the Koistinen article (Koistinen). Applicants traverse this rejection below.

A. The Present Invention

The present invention recites a technique for deriving and applying quality of service specifications in a component-based development environment.

B. Differences between the Claims and the Cited Art

Bachmann discloses a technical foundation for component-based software engineering. A reference model of software component technology is discussed. Technical concepts of software component technology, including components, interfaces, contracts, models, frameworks, composition and certification are also addressed.

Independent Claim 1 recites “a quality of service specification derivation element having for output an application model in combination with a quality of service specification derived by implication from relations between components, control flows, data flows and resources”. Relative to this element, the Office Action cites Section 5.2.3 on page 13. This passage is entitled “Specifying Quality of Service”. However, the details of the quality of service specification derivation element of Claim 1 are not suggested, taught or disclosed. There is no discussion of how a quality of service specification is derived. There is no disclosure that a quality of service specification is derived by implication. There is no discussion that a quality of service specification is derived by implication from relations between components, control flows, data flows and resources.


Given that subject matter from Claim 1 is not taught, suggested or disclosed by

Bachmann, it follows that the Office Action has failed to show that Bachmann anticipates Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Bachmann. Since independent Claim 18 was also rejected for the same reasoning as Claim 1, it follows that independent Claim 18 also distinguishes over Bachmann. It also follows that the dependent claims also distinguish over Bachmann and/or the combination of Bachmann and Koistinen, since Koistinen does not teach, suggest or disclose the subject matter from Claim 1 (and it has not been alleged in the Office Action that the 'missing' subject matter from Claim 1 is found in Koistinen).

#### IV. Summary

Applicants have presented technical explanations and arguments fully supporting their position that the pending claims contain subject matter which is not taught, suggested or disclosed by Bachmann, Koistinen or any combination thereof. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present Application is in a condition for Allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory M. Doudnikoff  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 32,847

GMD:ssc

Docket No:GB920000055US1

PHONE: 919-254-1288

FAX: 919-254-4330